

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/521,135	01/12/2005	Karst Vaartjes	NL 020674	6812	
24737 75	90 01/11/2006		EXAMINER		
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			SANEI, HAN	SANEI, HANA ASMAT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2879		

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/521,135	VAARTJES ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Hana A. Sanei	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 A	ugust 2005.				
, —	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2005 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecte drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Noti	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/24/05, 1/12/05</u> .	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Preliminary Amendment, filed on 1/12/05, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the instant application.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricx et al (WO 200067294 A1) in view of Bruninx-Poesen et al (US 4422011).

With respect to Claim 1, Hendricx teaches a metal halide lamp (Page 1, lines 1-2) comprising a substantially cylindrical discharge vessel (see at least Figure 2) having an internal diameter Di < 2.0 mm (Page 2, lines 3-5) and filled

Art Unit: 2879

with an ionizable filling (Page 1, lines 1-5), wherein two electrodes (4,5) are present at a mutual distance EA (refer to at least Figure 2), wherein the filling comprises an inert gas (Xe, Page 1, lines 24-26) having a pressure at room temperature between 5 and 25 bar (Page 4, lines 13-19).

Hendricx lacks an ionizable salt that is selected from the group comprising Prl₃, Ndl₃, Lul₃. In the same field of endeavor, Bruninx-Poesen teaches an ionizable salt that is selected from the group comprising Prl₃, Ndl₃, Lul₃ (Col.4, lines 3-7) in order to ensure proper arc stability (Col. 2, lines 15-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the specified ionizable salt, as disclosed by Bruninx-Poesen, in the metal halide lamp of Hendricx in order to ensure proper arc stability.

With respect to Claim 2, Hendricx teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Hendricx lacks an ionizable salt further comprising NaI, and wherein the molar ratio NaI/(PrI.sub.3+NdI.sub.3+LuI.s-ub.3) lies between 1.0 and 10.3. In the same field of endeavor, Bruninx-Poesen teaches an ionizable salt further comprising NaI, and wherein the molar ratio NaI/ (PrI.sub.3+NdI.sub.3+LuI.sub.3) lies between 1.0 and 10.3 (extrapolation numbers resulting from Tables corresponding to Examples 1-4 (for Di = 15.5 mm) and Examples 5-8 (for Di = 11.5)) in order to ensure proper arc stability (Col. 2, lines 15-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the specified ionizable salt, as disclosed by Bruninx-Poesen, in the metal halide lamp of Hendricx in order to ensure proper arc stability.

Art Unit: 2879

With respect to Claim 3, Hendricx teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Hendricx lacks a molar ratio Nal/Prl.sub.3 lies between 2.3 and 10.3. In the same field of endeavor, Bruninx-Poesen teaches a molar ratio Nal/Prl.sub.3 lies between 2.3 and 10.3 (extrapolation numbers resulting from Tables corresponding to Examples 1-4 (for Di = 15.5 mm) and Examples 5-8 (for Di = 11.5)) in order to ensure proper arc stability (Col. 2, lines 15-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the specified ionizable salt, as disclosed by Bruninx-Poesen, in the metal halide lamp of Hendricx in order to ensure proper arc stability.

With respect to Claim 4, Hendricx teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Hendricx lacks an amount of Prl.sub.3 in the discharge vessel is between 10 and 335.mu.mol/cm.sup.3. In the same field of endeavor, Bruninx-Poesen teaches an amount of Prl.sub.3 in the discharge vessel is between 10 and 335.mu.mol/cm.sup.3 (extrapolation numbers resulting from Tables corresponding to Examples 1-4 (for Di = 15.5 mm) and Examples 5-8 (for Di = 11.5)) in order to ensure proper arc stability (Col. 2, lines 15-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the specified ionizable salt, as disclosed by Bruninx-Poesen, in the metal halide lamp of Hendricx in order to ensure proper arc stability.

With respect to Claim 5, Hendricx teaches the invention set forth above (see rejection in Claim 1 above). Hendricx lacks a molar ratio Nal/Ndl.sub.3 lies

Art Unit: 2879

between 3.0 and 6.7. In the same field of endeavor, Bruninx-Poesen teaches a molar ratio Nal/Ndl.sub.3 lies between 3.0 and 6.7 (extrapolation numbers resulting from Tables corresponding to Examples 1-4 (for Di = 15.5 mm) and Examples 5-8 (for Di = 11.5)) in order to ensure proper arc stability (Col. 2, lines 15-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add the specified ionizable salt, as disclosed by Bruninx-Poesen, in the metal halide lamp of Hendricx in order to ensure proper arc stability.

With respect to Claim 9, Hendricx teaches that Di < 1.5 mm (Page 2, lines 15-16).

With respect to Claim 10, Hendricx teaches that EA lies between 3 mm and 7 mm (Page 5, line 17).

With respect to Claim 11, Hendricx teaches that the discharge vessel has a ceramic wall (Page 1, lines 1-2).

With respect to Claim 12, Hendricx teaches that the discharge vessel is surrounded by a gas-filled outer bulb (Page 5, lines 22-23).

With respect to Claim 13, Hendricx teaches that the lamp power lies between 20 W and 40 W (Page 5, lines 11-13).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-8 are objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including al of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2879

The following is an examiner's statement of reason for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a metal halide lamp comprising all of the limitation set forth in Claims 6-8 respectively, particularly comprising the limitations of an amount of Ndl₃ between 8 and 301 umol/cm³, a molar ratio of Nal/Lul₃ between 1.0 and 3.2, and an amount of Lul₃ between 15 and 414 umol/cm³, together with the other cited limitations.

Other Prior Art Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Maseki et al (US 5220244 A) teaches a metal halide discharge lamp comprising NdI₃.

Dakin et al (US 5363015 A) teaches an arc discharge lamp containing Prl₃ and/or Ndl₃.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hana A. Sanei whose telephone number is (571) 272-8654. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2879

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tollfree).

Examiner

12/27/05 Hana A. Sanei

Joseph Williams